

**REMARKS**

Applicants wish to thank Examiner Pinkney and Examiner Sugarman for meeting with Dr. Casper and Applicants' representatives on October 29, 2008 and via teleconference on November 11, 2008 to discuss the claimed invention and the rejection of the pending claims. An agreement was reached that Applicants would present revised claims to improve their clarity. As agreed, Applicants have amended the claims to clarify the phrase "inhibiting melatonin suppressing light" and to revise the term "capable of suppressing" in claims 13 and 16. As amended the claims refer to a device for "inhibiting melatonin suppression by light." For example, claim 1 recites:

1. A device for inhibiting melatonin ~~suppressing~~ suppression by light comprising: means for selectively blocking more than 50 percent of incident wavelengths of light having a wavelength range less than at or about 530 nm, while transmitting more than 50 percent of non-blocked wavelengths of light, wherein the device inhibits the light-induced suppression of melatonin production by light exposure when ~~worn~~ used at night.

Applicants have also amended claims 13 and 16 to recite:

13. A light device comprising an optical filter operable to selectively block more than 50 percent of incident wavelengths of light from the light device having a wavelength ~~capable of~~ suppressing that suppresses melatonin production . . . .

16. A light cover for use with a light device, the cover comprising: an optical filter operable to selectively block more than 50 percent of incident wavelengths of light from the light device

having a wavelength ~~-capable of suppressing~~ that suppresses  
melatonin production . . . .

Applicants have also amended claim 9 to depend on claim 2 rather than claim 1, and claim 21 to depend on claim 20 rather than claim 19.


In view of the amendments and foregoing remarks in addition to Applicants' August 19, 2008 Reply, Applicants request that the Examiner reconsider the rejections of claims 1-3, 7-12 and 17-18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for purportedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,400,175 ("Johansen et al."), claims 13-14 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) for purportedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,902,296 ("Searfoss") and claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for purportedly being unpatentable over U.S. 6,019,476 ("Kirshner").

If there are any questions regarding this amendment or the application in general, a telephone call to the undersigned would be appreciated since this should expedite the prosecution of the application for all concerned.

If necessary to effect a timely response, this paper should be considered as a petition for an Extension of Time sufficient to effect a timely response, and please charge any deficiency in fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 05-1323 (Docket #101648.55966US).

Respectfully submitted,

November 13, 2008

  
Mary Anne Schofield  
Registration No. 36,669

CROWELL & MORING LLP  
Intellectual Property Group  
P.O. Box 14300  
Washington, DC 20044-4300  
Telephone No.: (202) 624-2500  
Facsimile No.: (202) 628-8844  
MAS.mas  
dn#6590291\_1